

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully traverse and request consideration. Claims 1-9, 11-16 and 18-24 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 7, 13, 14 and 19 are hereby amended.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the notice that claims 6, 7, 12, 13 and 20 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Summary of Office Action mailed September 25, 2007

Claims 1-7, 13-21, and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. See USPTO Office Action, page 2, paragraph 2 (mail date: Sep. 25, 2007), [hereinafter “Sep. 25 OA”].

Claims 1-5, 8-9, 11, 14-16, 19, and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Cytron, et al., (*Efficiently Computing Static Single Assignment Form and the Control Dependence Graph*, 1991, ACM), of record, [hereinafter “Cytron”]. See Sep. 25 OA, page 4, paragraph 11.

35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections

Regarding claims 1, 7, 13, 14 and 19, Applicants have amended the claims to correct typographical errors. As such, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection of claims 1, 7, 13, 14 and 19 is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 18 applicants respectfully point out that the first element requires, among other things, *a super word register operably coupled to the at least one processor*. Therefore, Claim 18 already has proper antecedent basis regarding *the super word register*.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection of Claim 18 is respectfully requested.

Claim 19 has been amended to correct the typographical error. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection of the Claim 19 and its dependent claims 20 and 23 is respectfully requested in light of the amendment to Claim 19.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejections

Regarding Claim 1, the Examiner asserts that *Cytron* discloses, among other things, *examining a first instruction off of a work list in memory, wherein the first instruction includes a previous link and a write mask; examining at least one second instruction, wherein the at least one second instruction is a source of the first instruction and wherein each of the at least one second instruction includes a previous link and a written mask.* See Sep. 25 OA, page 5, paragraph 12. While the cited portion of the reference *Cytron*, page 477 discusses control dependencies between nodes, *Cytron* certainly has no disclosure of a previous link or a first instruction, including a previous link. See Cytron, page 477. Instead, *Cytron* merely teaches employing control dependencies between nodes.

The second cited portion of the *Cytron* reference, Cytron, at page 480, discusses the data structures related to a dead code elimination scheme as shown in *Cytron*, Figure 17. However, *Cytron* has no disclosure or discussion of a write mask, as required by Claim 1. The previous link of Applicants' Claim 1 provides for connecting instructions that write different components of the same resource. While the write mask of Applicants Claim 1 provides the advantage of determining the number of elements of a super word register. See Applicants' Specification, paragraph 0019.

If the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of Claim 1 is maintained under *Cytron*, Applicants respectfully request a showing by specific page and line number of *Cytron* with respect to the write mask and the previous link. Dependent claims 2, 3, 4 and 5, which add novel and non-obvious subject matter are likewise allowable in view of the discussion with respect to claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 8 and with respect to *Cytron*, the cited portions pages 477, 479 and 480, do not disclose a previous link or write mask and do not disclose *adding to each instruction a previous link; adding to each instruction a write mask*. Therefore, claim 8 is likewise distinguishable from *Cytron*. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claim 8 is respectfully requested. Regarding claims 9, 11 and 22, which depend from and include all limitations of independent claim 8, and being rejected as incorporating the rejection in claim 8, are likewise allowable based on the discussion above with respect to claim 8. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 9, 11 and 22 is respectfully requested.

Regarding Claim 14, *Cytron* does not disclose, among other things, *examine a first instruction off a work list, wherein the first instruction includes previous link and a write mask; examine at least one second instruction wherein the at least one second instruction is a source of the first instruction and each of the at least one second instruction includes a previous link and a write mask*. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of independent claim 14 and its dependent claims 15, 16, 21 and 23, which add novel and non-obvious subject matter, is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 19 and with respect to the above discussion regarding *Cytron*, *Cytron* has no disclosure of *add to each instruction a previous link; add to each instruction a write mask*. Reconsideration and withdrawal of 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claim 19 and its dependent claim 24 is respectfully requested in light of the discussion with respect to claim 19.

CONCLUSION

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. Also, no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant(s) has/have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any additional fees arising as a result of this response, including any fees for Extensions of Time, or any other communication from or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 22-0259.

It is submitted that the claims clearly define the invention, are supported by the specification and drawings, and are in a condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any questions or concerns that may expedite prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 25, 2008

By: /Joseph T. Cygan/
Joseph T. Cygan
Registration No. 50,937

Vedder Price P.C.
222 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2600
Chicago, Illinois 60601
phone: (312) 609-7945
fax: (312) 609-5005